

SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE



3 2449 0472458 1

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Lyrasis Members and Sloan Foundation

<http://www.archive.org/details/investigationint00burt>

An Investigation into Sternberg Differentiation in Secondary Spanish

A Research Project Presented to the Faculty of Sweet Briar College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Teaching

By

Mary Danielle Burton

April 24, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Definition of Problem and Hypothesis	2
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	5
Chapter Three: Method.....	18
Chapter Four: Results.....	25
Chapter Five: Discussion.....	33
Appendices	
Appendix A: Triarchic Theory of Intelligences Robert Sternberg.....	37
Appendix B: Lesson Plans.....	39
References.....	58

CHAPTER ONE: DEFINITION OF PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESIS

My love for the Spanish language and cultures has guided my path from high school to college, from Latin America to Spain, and finally, back to college to complete a graduate degree in teaching. I decided that I wanted to take one of my passions in life and turn it into a career. I realized that taking courses in a foreign language at the college level, and the experience of study abroad, had added immensely to my personal development as a human being. The thought of bringing some of that richness into a secondary classroom sounded very exciting and promising, both for myself and for my future students.

I couldn't wait to get into the classroom and see what it was all about. I thought back to my experience in high school. My academic experience had made no impression in my mind. There were only a handful of teachers that really reached me and engaged me in learning. There was a limit to the amount of quality instruction that I received. Ironically enough, my experience in secondary Spanish classes was one of the worst. My level one class was great, but the instructor left at the end of the year. Somewhere in the middle of level two I became lost and gave up. I barely made it through Spanish three. What finally rekindled my interest in foreign languages was a trip to Spain, which became the beginning of this journey. I was finally able to see the genius of foreign language learning (Levy, 1996), which I see as the ability to communicate in another language with people from around the world. Most experts in the field of language learning and teaching would agree.

As I began to observe in secondary Spanish classes, I saw that today's students in language classrooms are often having the same experience I had. The approach is still

often bottom-up and the teacher is still the focus of the classroom. The students sit and absorb information that will later be regurgitated on a test. They are still very far from reaching the American Council of Teacher's of Foreign Languages' (ACTFL) standards for language learning, which defines the goal of communicative competence. The main reason for this is that language teachers often ignore the established national and state standards. Foreign language instruction is now part of the core curriculum in education. It seems that with the absence of a standardized test in our field, the standards are often ignored.

In the fields of education, second language acquisition, and psychology, studies on differentiation by learning profiles in foreign language classrooms are limited. There are two published studies that support differentiation by learning profiles in foreign language classrooms. Robert Sternberg and his colleagues have conducted research on reading achievement across several disciplines. Although the studies were large and covered several disciplines, including French, there are no published studies on differentiation through intelligence preference in Spanish language classrooms at the secondary level. The second study was published by Marjorie Hall Haley and supports improved academic achievement through differentiation by multiple intelligences in foreign language and English as a Second Language classrooms.

Through a combination of reflection on secondary foreign language education, observations of Spanish classrooms, and through many hours of research, a question developed.

RESEARCH QUESTION: Does differentiation by students' analytical, creative, and

practical intelligences improve reading comprehension in a fourth year secondary Spanish class?

NULL HYPOTHESIS: Differentiation by students' analytical, creative, and practical intelligences will create no difference in students' reading achievement in fourth year Spanish.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS: Differentiation by students' analytical, creative, and practical intelligences will improve students' reading achievement in a fourth year secondary Spanish class.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In the past, and to some extent in the present, the norm in foreign language classrooms was for the teacher to be the focus of the classroom, not the student. In the beginning, the field took a bottom-up approach to second language instruction. Instruction was focused on students' ability to "analyze grammar rules and vocabulary, and then later using them in communication" (Glisan & Shrum, 2005, p. 51). The bottom-up approach used in foreign language teaching emphasized the teacher as the focus of the classroom. The teacher assumed the role of drill instructor; the student was a passive receiver of information. In *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen* (1995), James E. Lee and Bill VanPatten describe the Atlas complex that has often been seen in foreign language classrooms. The term comes from an analogy drawn from Atlas, a titan of Greek mythology who was condemned to support the heavens on his shoulders. Instructors in language classrooms have conducted themselves in the same manner as Atlas because they "...assume full responsibility for all that goes on. They supply motivations, insight, clear explanations, even intellectual curiosity. In exchange their students supply almost nothing but a faint imitation of the academic performance that they witness..." (Lee & VanPatten, 1995, p. 6). In their efforts to demonstrate and improve on explaining the area of expertise, foreign language instructors failed to involve students in the learning process.

In the history of foreign language teaching and learning there is a series of movements, each in response to previous movements. These changes did not lead language learners towards the ability to actually use their skills. Audiolingualism, which followed grammar translation and direct instruction, was a more oral approach to language learning. Even in practicing oral communication skills, the students were still

only practicing patterns and forms at the command of the instructor (Lee & VanPatten, 1995). In the 1960s, the Cognitive approach arose in response to Audiolingualism and “was based largely on Chomsky’s (1965) claims that an individual’s linguistic knowledge does not reflect conditioned behavior but rather the ability to create an infinite number of novel responses” (Glisan & Shrum, 2005, p. 41). Despite the efforts to make language teaching more meaningful, there was still a large focus on grammar rules and vocabulary, which left little time for practice that would lead to communicative competence (Glisan & Shrum, 2005).

By the 1970s, language teaching and learning moved toward a more communicative approach. Communicative Language Teaching emerged from this movement, which focuses on both goals and processes in the classroom. A central concept in CTL is “*communicative competence*” which “is defined in terms of the expression, interpretation and negotiation of meaning” (Byram, 2003, p. 124). It is an approach, not a method, and it aims at actively involving the learner in their second language learning. The approach advocates developing communicative competence in the four skill areas of language learning: reading, writing, listening, and speaking (Byram, 2003). CLT has also seen many changes in its development. The most important change is the role of the instructor and student. The instructor should be seen as a “...*resource person and architect*”, not a drill instructor (Lee & VanPatten, 1995, p. 6).

In the field of second language teaching and learning, the focus of past research seems to be on the effectiveness of various methods of teaching foreign languages, such as Audiolingualism. In today’s world, most experts don’t prescribe a certain method of teaching foreign languages in our classrooms. The focus has changed from methods to

standards in response to the Clinton administration's Goals 2000 initiative, which recognized foreign languages as part of the core curriculum in the United States. In response to this initiative, the National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (1996) was born. It was a collaborative effort of the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), the American Association of Teachers of French (AATF), the American Association of Teachers of German (AATG), and the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP). The end result was *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century*, which was expanded in 1999 and was renamed *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (Glisan & Shrum, 2005). The book was published in 1999 and includes the relationship of the new standards to the previously published ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (1986), which were established to measure proficiency in four language skill areas: speaking, listening, writing and reading. The standards are not focused on skill areas. They are focused on five interconnected goal areas: communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities. The authors of this document have not forgotten the four skill areas, but attempts to embrace the speaking, listening, writing, and reading skills into the five goal areas. The goal is for foreign language students to reach a high level of communicative competence through a framework of interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational modes of communication (*Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century*, 1999).

By examining the framework of the three modes of communication, one can see how all four skills have been integrated into the new standards. The interpersonal mode is "characterized by active negotiation of meaning" (*Standards For Foreign Language*

Learning in the 21st Century, p. 36). There is a large focus on oral communication in this mode, but reading and writing are also used as a form of direct communication. Students communicate through speaking and writing, but they also receive information through listening to others speak and through reading what others have written. The interpretive mode requires students to “read (or listen) between the lines” (*Standards For Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century*, p. 36) and use their background knowledge and ideas. The focus is the “cultural interpretation of meanings” (*Standards For Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century*, p. 36) of spoken or written language. The word interpretation has replaced the word comprehension in an attempt to prevent an ethnocentric interpretation of foreign languages. The cultural literacy required to reach this level of interpretation is developed over time and will not automatically come to any student. In the presentational mode, the goal is to have members of the target culture and language be able to interpret the written or spoken message of the foreign language student (*Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century*, 1999).

Comprehension is necessary for second language acquisition to occur. In the past, the instructional focus has been placed on the interpersonal mode of communication. Because of a lack of knowledge about the process of interpretation, many foreign language teachers assumed that interpretation would develop over time (Glisan & Shrum, 2005). Judith L. Shrum and Eileen W. Glisan have explored the processes of listening and reading comprehension in foreign language students. Comprehension in both areas involves “both cognitive and social processes” (Glisan & Shrum, 2005, p. 158). When students listen and read they

...draw upon the following as they attempt to interpret a text:

- their knowledge of the target language, e.g., vocabulary, syntax;
- their background knowledge and experiences in the world;
- their knowledge of how various types of discourse, such as magazine articles, literary texts, radio broadcasts, and talk shows, are organized, i.e., use of cohesive devices such as pronouns, conjunctions, and transitional phrases to link meaning across sentences, as well as the use of coherence to maintain the message's unity;
- their ability to hold information in short-term memory as they attend to the text; and
- their ability to use a variety of strategies to help them bring meaning to the comprehension task (Glisan & Shrum, 2005, p. 158).

In addition, students use tasks and subskills in the comprehension processes that reflect bottom-up, or part to whole, processing and top-down, or whole to part, processing. The bottom-up approach is seen as being “*text-driven* and portrays the reader as someone who ‘approaches the text by concentrating exclusively on the combination of letters and words in a purely linear manner’”(Glisan & Shrum, 2005, p. 158). The top-down approach is “*reader-driven* and focus on what the reader/listener brings to the text in terms of knowledge of the world” (Glisan & Shrum, 2005, p. 159) Glisan and Shrum (2005) point out “the current view of the interpretive skills is that the listener/reader arrives at meaning by using *both* bottom-up and top-down processing” (p. 159).

As quoted above, Glisan and Shrum point out a number of factors that affect a L2 reader’s comprehension of a text. Although it is important to recognize these factors, it is equally important in foreign language instruction to recognize who the student is as an individual. The aforementioned ACTFL standards recognize the “diversity and the unique needs of learners” (Glisan & Shrum, 2005, p. 340). With this in mind, foreign language teachers can respond to student needs in order to improve language learning and competency in all skill areas. Glisan and Shrum recommend *differentiated instruction* to reach all learners in foreign language classrooms (2005, p. 340).

In recent years, the word *differentiation* has been on the lips of many educators, school administrators, researchers, and professors of teacher education programs. The development of this theory is in response to the changes that the American educational system has seen over the past two decades. In recent years educators have seen an increase in English language learners in our public schools, the achievement gap for minority students still exists, inclusive instruction for the learning disabled has become mainstream, and the progress of students with higher levels of academic success may be stalled due to their participation in classrooms that cannot accommodate their academic needs (Tomlinson, 2003).

The classrooms of the American educational system have always been diverse. Recently educators have seen the need to respond to this diversity in a systematic manner. In the past, one-size-fits all instruction was the norm in classroom teaching. This method assumes that all students are the same and therefore, they learn the same. It is obvious that this is not the case. Differentiation is instruction that responds to student differences and needs. The goal is to maximize each learner's potential. In order to do this, one has to consider who they are teaching, not just what they are teaching. Differentiated instruction responds to four student traits: readiness, interest, learning profile, and affect. Readiness is a student's current level of "...knowledge, understanding, and skill related to a particular sequence of learning" (Tomlinson, 2003, p. 3). It is important to emphasize *particular sequence of learning* because within any given content area, the introduction of a new concept can create problems for even the student's with the highest readiness levels. A student's interests are the topics that "...evoke curiosity and passion in a learner" (Tomlinson, 2003, p. 3). An effective teacher provides

opportunities for students to explore current interests, as well as develop new interests. A student's learning profile is simply "...how student's learn best" (Tomlinson, 2003, p. 3). Learning profiles are composed of learning style, intelligence preference, culture, and gender. The last element, affect, refers to how a student feels about three elements: "...themselves, their work, and the classroom as a whole" (Tomlinson, 2003, p. 4). All student traits change over time and vary depending to content area. When a teacher responds to these elements, it is more likely that learning will occur in their classroom (Tomlinson, 2003).

Once a teacher knows his or her student's traits, he or she can then respond to the following classroom elements: content, process, product and learning environment. Content is "...what teachers teach (or, what we want students to learn) and how students gain access to that body of knowledge" (Tomlinson, 2003, p. 4). In order for students to learn the knowledge, understanding, and skills of a unit or lesson, teachers must differentiate not only what they teach but also how they present the information. Process refers the way that students actually arrive at the end goals, such as the knowledge, understanding, and skills of a lesson or unit. Some examples are the activities and assignments that students work on during a sequence of learning. Products are the student "...assessments and demonstrations of what (they) have come to know, understand, and be able to do as the result of a sequence of learning" (Tomlinson, 2003, p. 5). The final classroom element that should be differentiated is the learning environment, or operation and tone, of a classroom (Tomlinson, 2003).

There are a variety of ways in which instruction can be differentiated according to student learning profile. The two most well known are multiple intelligences and

intelligence preference differentiation. There is limited research available on differentiation according to learning profile in foreign language classrooms; however, two such studies do exist and do support academic improvement through learning style differentiation in foreign language classrooms.

Howard Gardner and Robert Sternberg are two psychologists that challenge the traditional views on intelligence. In his book, *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (1983), Gardner begins by analyzing several earlier views of intelligence and their development over time. As a result of the need to categorize people, intelligence testing was developed. In the past, the single number of an IQ score was considered the determining factor in one's ability to be successful in school and in life. Gardner addresses the flaws of this type of testing and states that it is "...skewed in favor of individuals in societies with schooling and particularly in favor of individuals who are accustomed to taking paper and pencil tests" (Gardner, 1983, p. 16). He suggests instead that there is not one intelligence but rather a "...number of intellectual strengths, or competencies, each of which may have its own developmental history" (Gardner, 1983, p.153).

In *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (1983), Gardner first proposed that there are six intelligences. The first, the Linguistic intelligence, applies to writers, poets, linguists, journalists, and any other person or profession that uses language as a tool to accomplish their goals, which may vary (Gardner, 1983, p.7). The second, the Musical intelligence, relates to people who "...create, perform, and appreciate music" (Gardner, 2005, p.7). The third, the Logical-Mathematical intelligence, pertains to "...the intelligence of a logician, mathematician, [and/or] scientist" (Gardner, 2005, p.7). The

fourth, the Spatial intelligence, focuses on the "...capacity to form mental imagery of the world...and to manipulate those mental images" (Gardner, 2005, p. 8). The fifth intelligence, the Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence, involves "...the capacity to solve problems or fashion products using your whole body, or parts of your body, like your hands or mouth. This intelligence is exhibited by athletes, dancers, actors, craftspersons, and again, surgeons" (Gardner, 2005, p. 8). In 1983, when *Frames of Mind* was first published, Gardner proposed that the sixth intelligence was comprised of what he called the Personal Intelligences. Since then, he has divided the Personal intelligences into two separate intelligences; therefore, the sixth intelligence is considered to be the Interpersonal intelligence, which "...involves the understanding of other persons- how to interact with them, how to motivate them, how to understand their personalities, etc." (Gardner, 2005, p. 8). The seventh intelligence, the Intrapersonal intelligence is "...the capacity to understand oneself- one's strengths, weaknesses, desires, [and] fears" (Gardner, 2005, p.8). Gardner also added an eighth intelligence to his theory, the Naturalist intelligence, which "...involves the capacity to make consequential distinctions in nature..." (Gardner, 2005, p. 8).

With this new theory of intelligence came a new theory of teaching that focuses on student-centered instruction, the driving force behind differentiation. All content can be differentiated according to students' learning profiles, which include multiple intelligences. As mentioned before, foreign language learning can be improved by responding to students' needs (Glisan & Shrum, 2005). Marjorie Hall Haley is conducting one of the studies that support differentiation by learning profiles. It is four

phase, action research study that addresses the effects of differentiation by multiple intelligences in second language classrooms. In the second phase of the study,

. . . [Twenty-three] foreign language and English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers and 650 students from eight states and three countries participated in an action research study to determine the impact of implementing the theory of multiple intelligences (MI) in daily classroom activities (Haley, 2004, p. 163).

The researcher collected qualitative and quantitative data to document the effect of the multiple intelligences intervention on foreign language learning. Data collection occurred during the third 9-weeks of the school year. Although the experiment and the control group improved in their abilities to read and write in the target language, “. . . students in the experimental groups receiving MI-based instruction outperformed those in the control groups” (Haley, 2004, p. 171). The results from phase three are expected to be published soon. This study is currently in its fourth phase.

The aforementioned study on multiple intelligences supports differentiation by students' learning profiles; however, intelligence preferences are the focus of the present action research study. Yale psychologist Robert Sternberg has spent the majority of his career researching intelligence. Like Gardner, he examines the concept of intelligence and he challenges the traditional views. He defines intelligence as a construct, or a “...way of saying some people adapt to the environments that we both create and confront better than others” (Sternberg, 2005, p. 103). There are many approaches to understanding the construct of intelligence. Sternberg takes a systems approach and examines the interrelated factors of intelligence in “...an attempt to understand how intelligence functions as a system” (Sternberg, 2005, p. 103). In this attempt, Sternberg developed the Triarchic Theory of Successful Intelligence, which explains the relationship between individual intelligence and three factors. The first is the relationship

between intelligence and the internal world of the individual. The second is the relationship between intelligence and experience. And the third is the relationship between intelligence and the external world of the individual. He defines successful intelligence as

. . . (1) the use of an integrated set of abilities needed to attain success in life, however an individual defines it, within his or her sociocultural context. People are successfully intelligent by virtue of (2) recognizing their strengths and making the most of them, at the same time that they recognize their weaknesses and find ways to correct or compensate for them. Successfully intelligent people (3) adapt to, shape, and select environments through (4) finding a balance in their use of analytical, creative, and practical abilities (Sternberg, 2005, p. 104).

In his book *Successful Intelligence* (1996) Sternberg defines some of the obstacles people face in their development of successful intelligence. Traditional tests, such as IQ testing and scholastic aptitude testing, can lead to negative expectations, which are attached to the scores that test takers receive. They are seen as an authority that dictates one's future success. These negative expectations can lead to a lowered sense of self-efficacy. The idea that test scores are related to, or predict, life achievement is misguided. They are labels, as where intelligence is a set of skills. In other words, IQ tests do not really measure intelligence (Sternberg, 1996).

Sternberg and his colleagues believe that "...many students could learn more effectively than they do now if they were taught in a way that better matched their patterns of abilities" (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2004, p. 274). They have developed the theory of intelligence into a form of classroom instruction, which is called Triarchic Instruction, in an attempt to link theory with practice. According to the theory, tasks should match well with people's dominant intelligence; therefore, "...analytical tasks involve analyzing, judging, evaluating, comparing and contrasting, and critiquing;

creative tasks involve creating, inventing, discovering, imagining, and supposing, and practical tasks involve implementing, using, applying, and seeking relevance” (Sternberg, Grigorenko, & Jarvin, 2002, p. 168).

Sternberg and his colleagues have conducted many studies that support the idea that teaching to the three different intelligence preferences can improve academic achievement. The most recently published studies were conducted at the elementary and secondary levels to examine the difference between conventional instruction and triarchic instruction in improving student reading achievement. The interventions were conducted in various subject areas such as language arts, math, physical sciences, social studies, history, foreign languages, and the arts. Their “goal was to show that triarchic teaching works in improving vocabulary and comprehension skills in virtually any subject matter” (Grigorenko, Jarvin, & Sternberg, 2002, p. 170). Reading achievement is defined as combination of vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension. In the results of all of the studies, the triarchic method was more effective in improving student reading achievement (Grigorenko, Jarvin, & Sternberg, 2002).

The literature review of this paper focuses on the development of second language instruction in the United States, the development of the ACTFL standards, the components that shape second language reading comprehension, and the research that supports differentiated instruction as a way to reach all learners in foreign language classrooms. Second language instruction and our country’s national goals for foreign language instruction and learning have changed considerably over the years. The most important change that has occurred is the role of teachers and students. Students should now be the focus in the classroom and teachers should be facilitators of learning. The

components that shape second language reading comprehension offer instructors the opportunity to respond to learner needs in a variety of ways. The multiple intelligences research supports differentiation by learning profile in a variety of language classrooms. The focus of this action research study is supported by a Triarchic method study that provides evidence that differentiation by intelligence preference can improve reading comprehension in foreign language classrooms. The Sternberg study was conducted in a French classroom. This study will seek to apply the same theory of instruction in a secondary Spanish classroom.

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

PURPOSE

There is some documented support that differentiation by learning profile can improve language learning in secondary students. Marjorie Hall Haley's research on Multiple Intelligences differentiation has shown academic improvement in students in a variety of settings. Robert Sternberg and his colleagues have demonstrated that differentiation by intelligence preferences can improve students' reading comprehension and achievement in foreign language classrooms, more specifically in a secondary French classroom. The purpose of this study was to address the following question: does differentiation by students' analytical, creative, and practical intelligences improve reading comprehension in a fourth year, secondary Spanish class? The action researcher hypothesized that differentiation by students' analytical, creative, and practical intelligences would improve students' reading achievement in a fourth year secondary Spanish class.

SAMPLE POPULATION

Research was conducted by one student teacher in a rural school system in Virginia. The students were eleventh and twelfth graders enrolled in two fourth year Spanish classes. The data collection for the study took place during the fourth marking term of the year. The students were not randomly selected.

The control group was a first period, fourth year Spanish class that met from 7:45 to 8:35 in the morning. There were twenty-three students enrolled in the class. Thirteen students were female and 10 students were male. The experimental group was a seventh period, fourth year Spanish class that met from 1:55 to 2:45 in the afternoon. There were twenty-four students enrolled in the class. Sixteen students were female and eight students were male.

MATERIALS

The control group materials were very limited. The students used their textbook *Galería de arte y vida* (Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, 1997). The teacher used a real “abanico” (a fan) to introduce the story. From the textbook, they read the story “El Abanico” by Vicente Riva Palacio. They used vocabulary exercises and reading comprehension questions from the textbook. No supplementary materials were used. Students were not asked to produce anything beside the answers to the vocabulary practice and the reading comprehension questions.

The experiment group also used limited materials. They used the same textbook, *Galería de arte y vida* (Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, 1997). They also read the story “El Abanico” by Vicente Riva Palacio. The fan was used to introduce the story. Supplementary materials included graphic organizers and task assignment sheets for the differentiated activities.

Both groups were administered the reading comprehension section of the 2005 National Spanish Exam. The results from the exams were used to run the statistical analysis.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The action researcher selected the control group. The instruction was teacher-focused, direct-instruction. There was no differentiation or group work. The textbook and an “abanico” (a fan) were the only visual aids that were used. Students completed vocabulary exercises out of the book to aid them in the readings. After reading the selections, students answered comprehension questions from the textbook. The focus of the instruction was rote drill.

The action researcher selected the experiment group. The instruction was differentiated by the students’ strongest Sternberg intelligence preference. In order to identify the students’ dominant intelligence preference, the students completed the Triarchic Theory of Intelligence Survey (Appendix A). In addition to the vocabulary practice and the

reading comprehension questions, each day students participated in activities that were designed to address their strongest intelligence preference.

TABLE A

	DAY ONE Tuesday, April 4, 2006	DAY TWO Wednesday, April 5, 2006	DAY THREE Thursday, April 6, 2006	DAY FOUR Friday, April 7, 2006
EXPERIMENT	“El Abanico” - Intelligence Preference Differentiation	“El Abanico” Intelligence Preference Differentiation	“El Abanico” Intelligence Preference Differentiation	Measurement National Spanish Examination
CONTROL	“El Abanico” Direct Instruction	“El Abanico” Direct Instruction	“El Abanico” Direct Instruction	Measurement National Spanish Examination

METHOD (Please see Appendix B for control and experimental group lesson plans)

DAY ONE: Tuesday, April 4, 2006

As a homework assignment on the night of Monday, April 3rd, 2006, students in the control group had to review and complete the practice for the vocabulary words on page 209 of the textbook. They had to read part I of the story, “El Abanico”, on page 211. The last part of the assignment was to complete the comprehension activity for part I on page 215. When class began, the teacher presented the class with a real Spanish fan as a visual aid. The teacher then read page 207, which introduced the chapter and its main theme, Hispanic sentiment, passion, and expression. From page 208, the teacher read and discussed the symbolism of the fan in Spanish culture and how the tradition traveled with the Spanish conquistadors to the New World. The teacher asked the students to define the vocabulary words for part I of the story. The class then reviewed and checked their answers for the

vocabulary practice on page 209. Afterwards, the class reviewed and checked their responses to the comprehension activity on page 215. The homework assignment was to define the vocabulary words for the second part of the story, to read the second part of the story, and to complete the comprehension questions of the story on page 215.

The experimental group had the same homework assignment as the control group. The teacher used the same visual aid, the fan, as an introduction to the story. The teacher also read pages 207 and 208 to introduce the main theme of the story, Hispanic sentiment, passion, and expression. The class quickly reviewed the answers to the vocabulary practice and the comprehension activity from the book, which was homework from the night before. Students were then placed in groups according to their strongest intelligence preference. Students whose dominant intelligence preference was analytical were instructed to identify the plot, theme, setting, and characters of the story. Students whose dominant intelligence preference was practical were instructed to write an advertisement for a theatrical reproduction of the story. Students whose dominant intelligence preference was creative were instructed to design a graphic organizer that addressed the literary elements that the analytical group had to identify. When the analytical and creative groups were finished, they had to fill in the graphic organizer with the answers from the analytical group's assignment. When all groups completed their assignments, they shared their products with the class. The practical group read their advertisement and the creative and analytical group presented their combined work, which addressed the plot, them, setting, and characters of the story. The experiment group was assigned the same homework assignment as the control group. They had to define the vocabulary words for the second part of the story, to read the section part of the story, and to complete the comprehension questions of the story on page 215.

DAY TWO: Wednesday, April 5, 2006

As an introduction for the control group on the second day of the study, the teacher asked the students if they were familiar with any other stories that were similar to "El Abanico". The students responded to the question and discussed their examples. The class

defined the vocabulary words for the second part of the story. The class then reviewed and checked their answers for the vocabulary practice on page 210. Afterwards, the class reviewed and checked their responses to the comprehension questions for the second section of the story on page 215. The homework assignment was to complete the vocabulary practice on page 210, to read the third part of the story, and to complete the comprehension questions A for the third part of the story on page 216.

The experimental group was asked the same question as an introduction. They responded to the questions and discussed their examples. The class then quickly reviewed their answers for their homework assignment for the night before: vocabulary practice and the comprehension questions from the book on part two of the story. Afterwards, assignments were given based on students' strongest intelligence preference. Students whose strongest intelligence preference was analytical had to fill out a graphic organizer that compared and contrasted the qualities that the main character was looking for in a partner to the qualities that the students might look for in a partner. Students whose strongest preference was practical had to skim the story for unfamiliar words and make a Spanish to English vocabulary list using the graphic organizer that was provided. Students whose strongest intelligence preference was creative had to write a short summary of parts one and two of the story and then write a prediction of what was going to happen in part three of the story. When all groups finished their work, they shared their products with the class. The experimental group had the same homework assignment as the control group. They had to complete the vocabulary practice on page 210, to read the third part of the story, and to complete the comprehension questions A for the third part of the story on page 216.

DAY THREE: Thursday, April 6, 2006

As an introduction for the control group the teacher asked students how their perspective on relationships was different from the relationships in the story. The students responded to the question and discussed their answers. The class then defined the vocabulary words for the third part of the story. The class then reviewed and checked their

answers for the vocabulary practice on page 210. Afterwards, the class reviewed and checked their responses to the comprehension questions A for the third section of the story on page 216. Then the class completed comprehension B on page 216. The anchoring activity was “Por si Acaso...” from page 217, which was a discussion activity that addressed customs that are associated with weddings. As a closure activity the teacher asked the students what they thought the author’s main point was and if they had gained anything from the story.

The introduction was the same for the experimental group. They were asked how their perspective on relationships was different from the relationships in the story. The students responded to the question and discussed their answers. The class then quickly reviewed their answers for the homework assignment from the night before: the vocabulary practice and the comprehension questions A from the textbook. Afterwards, the students were given assignments according to their strongest intelligence preference. Students whose strongest intelligence preference was analytical had to critique the story for its intent, tone, and humor. They also had to return to the graphic organizer from Tuesday’s class and add to it with the new information from parts two and three of the story. Students whose strongest intelligence preference was practical had to write an abbreviated translation of “El Abanico” for a children’s book. Students whose strongest intelligence preference was creative had to create an alternate ending to the story in the form of narration. They had to write this in Spanish. When all groups finished their work, they shared their products with the class. As an additional closure activity the teacher asked the students what they thought the author’s main point was and if they had gained anything from the story.

DAY FOUR: Friday, April 7, 2006

On the last day of the study, both the control group and the experiment group took the reading comprehension section of the National Spanish Examination. The test was from 2005 and was the Level III exam. The scores were used to collect quantitative data, which

were analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U Test, a nonparametric T-test for independent means.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to address the following question: does differentiation by students' analytical, creative, and practical intelligences improve reading comprehension in a fourth year, secondary Spanish class? The action researcher hypothesized that differentiation by students' analytical, creative, and practical intelligences would improve students' reading achievement in a fourth year secondary Spanish class.

Over the course of four days, the action researcher taught the normal curriculum in two Spanish four classes at the secondary level. There was one control group and one experimental group. For three days the control group received traditional instruction. During the same time frame, the experimental group received differentiated instruction according to the students' strongest intelligence preferences. On the fourth day, both groups took the reading comprehension section of the 2005 National Spanish Examination. The action researcher offered one day for exam make-ups for students that were absent on the testing date. The following description documents what changed from the original method during implementation of the research study.

DAY ONE: TUESDAY, APRIL 4th, 2006

CONTROL

On Monday, April 3rd, 2006 all students were present for the control group; therefore, all students received the homework assignment to complete vocabulary practice and reading comprehension questions on the first part of the story "El Abanico". On the first official day of the study, April 4th, ten students were called from class to participate in a community college placement exam. These students were instructed to

check their homework with a classmate before class the following day. They were also instructed to complete their homework assignment for April 4th. That assignment was to complete the vocabulary practice and reading comprehension questions for the second part of the story. There were also three other students absent from class; therefore, there were eight students present in the control group.

The action researcher conducted class using traditional methods. The researcher facilitated responses to the vocabulary practice and the reading comprehension questions. The students would provide answers and the teacher would confirm if their answers were correct. If they were not correct, the teacher would provide the students with the correct answers. After the class had reviewed and corrected their answers, the class discussed the story through the following basic literary elements of the story: plot, theme, setting, and characters. No visual aids were used. The class finished the lesson plan in the allotted time.

EXPERIMENT

On Monday, April 3rd there was one student absent from the experimental group; therefore, these students did not receive the homework assignment to complete vocabulary practice and reading comprehension questions on the first part of the story “El Abanico”. On the first official day of the study, April 4th, there were seven students absent from the experimental group for a school activity. They were instructed to check their homework with a classmate that was present in class on Tuesday. They were also provided with the differentiated activities according to their strongest intelligence preference and the homework assignment.

The action researcher reviewed the homework with the students from the experimental group first. A shorter time frame was allotted with the experimental group than with the control group because of the differentiated activities that were to follow. The analytical, creative, and practical students were able to complete their assignments in the time allotted. They did share their products and discuss the story but this part of the class was rushed. The students did not have adequate time. Students were assigned the same homework assignment as the control group.

DAY TWO: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5th, 2006

CONTROL

There were three students absent from the control group on the second day of the study. The review of the vocabulary practice was conducted in the same traditional method that was used on Tuesday. The students had no problems with that content. When the researcher began to solicit answers from the students on the reading comprehension questions, it became apparent that the second part of the story had been very difficult for the students to understand. There was a lot of figurative language in Spanish in the text. The students had answered the comprehension questions but they did not understand the meaning behind their answers. The researcher translated the second part of the story to English. The figurative language was difficult for them to understand in English as well. The majority of the class period was dedicated to translating and breaking down the content in order for the students to be able to understand how the literary elements of the story had developed and changed. They were assigned the vocabulary practice and the reading comprehension questions for the last part of the story as homework.

EXPERIMENT

There were four students absent from the experimental group on the third day of the study. The class was able to review the vocabulary practice quickly. The experimental group also had problems with the content from the second section of story. The figurative language in the text was difficult for the students to understand. They had answered the questions but the language in the text made it difficult for them to understand their answers. The researcher translated the text to English in order to help their comprehension of the figurative language. The students still found the figurative language a little confusing. The research used more time to review the homework than what was originally planned. This shortened the time that the students had to work on the differentiated activities. All of the differentiated activities were longer than the activities that the students completed on the first day of the study. The students were able to complete their activities, but the students felt rushed to complete the assignment by the end of the class period. The class ended before students were able to share their products. The researcher moved this part of the lesson to the next day. The students were assigned the same homework assignment as the control group. They had to complete the vocabulary practice and the reading comprehension for the last part of the story.

DAY THREE: THURSDAY, APRIL 6th, 2006

CONTROL

There was one student absent from the control group on Thursday, April 6th. The researcher and the students reviewed vocabulary words and the vocabulary practice. The method was traditional like the lessons on Tuesday and Wednesday. The teacher then read the last part of the story to the class. The students were asked to translate small

sections of the story into English. Afterwards, the teacher reviewed the answers to the reading comprehension questions from the last part of the story. The class discussed the third part of the story. The researcher finished by asking the class the closure question for the day.

EXPERIMENT

There were two students absent from the experimental group on Thursday, April 6th. The researcher decided to skip the introduction for the day's lesson in order to allow time to share the products from Wednesday. The analytical, creative, and practical students shared their products from the previous day. The researcher then reviewed the answers to homework from the night before. The students did not have as many problems understanding the last section of the story, although some clarification was necessary. Afterwards, the students completed the differentiated activities according to their strongest intelligence preferences. These differentiated activities did not take as much time as the activities from Wednesday; however, the lesson was still rushed because things had been pushed back from Wednesday to Thursday. The students were able to complete their assignments but the time allotted to share the day's products was not adequate.

DAY FOUR: FRIDAY 7th, 2006

CONTROL AND EXPERIMENT

The control and the experimental groups took the reading comprehension section of the 2005 Level III National Spanish Exam. In the past they had not spent very much time on their reading comprehension skills in Spanish; therefore, the Level III exam was chosen because it was a better match for all level four students' readiness levels. There

was one student absent from the control group. There was also one student absent from the experimental group. All other students completed the exam in the allotted time frame. No students had previously taken a standardized test in Spanish. The two students that were absent on Friday, April 7th, 2006, both made up the exam on Monday, April 10th, 2006.

DATA ANALYSIS

The action researcher hypothesized that differentiation by students' analytical, creative, and practical intelligences would improve students' reading achievement in a fourth year secondary Spanish class. The research hypothesis was a one-tailed, or directional, hypothesis that posited that the experiment groups' reading comprehension skills in Spanish would improve. As mentioned above, the National Spanish Exam scores were used as data for the study. The level of significance was set at the .05 level. The control and experiment sample populations were both under thirty; therefore, a nonparametric test was necessary. The researcher analyzed the data using the Mann-Whitney U test to compare two independent samples. Tables two and three are the actual individual scores that the participants received on the reading comprehension section of the National Spanish Exam. The sample population for the control group is represented by n_1 . The sample population for the experiment group is represented by n_2 .

Table 2. Results from the National Spanish Exam Reading Comprehension Section.

Control Group; $n_1=23$

83 83 83 83 67 83 67 83 50 33 67 83 67 33 83 33 67 33 50 33 33 67 67
--

Table 3. Results from the National Spanish Exam Reading Comprehension Section.

Experiment Group; $n_2=24$

50 67 00 50 67 67 50 67 83 83 67 33 50 33 50 50 33 50 33 83 100 50 17 67
--

Table four illustrates the results from the Mann-Whitney U test. The letter U represents the obtained value, which is the result of the statistical test. The letter P represents the significance level. One represents the significance for a two-tailed, or non-directional, research hypothesis. The other represents the significance for a one-tailed, or directional, research hypothesis. Since the research hypothesis of this study was directional, the one-tailed P was used to determine if the results from the statistical analysis were significant.

Table 4. U Test Results.

n_1	n_2	U	P (two-tailed)	P (one-tailed)
23	24	335.0	0.215866*	0.107933*
normal approx z= 1.2556			0.20926*	0.10463*

*These values are approximate.

The two samples are not significantly different ($P \geq 0.05$, one-tailed test).

There are two steps in determining a Mann-Whitney U test. First, the researcher compares the obtained U to the critical value necessary to reject the null hypothesis. For a Mann-Whitney U test, if the obtained value is more than the critical value, than the null should not be accepted. In other words, if the obtained value is less than the critical value, than the null cannot be rejected. Next, the researcher compares the significance of a Mann-Whitney U test to the established level of significance. If the obtained level of significance is greater than the established level of significance than the results of the test are not statistically significant.

For this study, the critical value needed to reject the null hypothesis was 183. The obtained value, U , was 335. The obtained value was greater than the critical value; therefore, the null can be rejected, but only if the obtained level of significance is less than the level of significance set by the researcher. The obtained level of significance (P) for a one-tailed test was larger (.107) than the set level of significance (.05). Hence, the two samples were not significantly different.

The results from the statistical analysis were not enough to reject the null hypothesis; however, the fact that the two samples were not significantly different does not mean that differentiation by students' analytical, creative, and practical abilities will not improve students' reading comprehension in secondary Spanish classrooms. It is possible that the results from the quantitative data analysis were influenced by the threats to the internal validity of the research study and its design. The researcher identified four main threats. First, the intervention did not take place for during a long enough period of time. Second, the groups were not comparative. Third, maturation could have affected the control and experiment groups, given the different times of the day that the students were in class. Finally, the administration of the National Spanish Exam could have affected the students' performance. The results, threats, and suggestions for further research are discussed in chapter five.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

There are two published research studies that support differentiation by students' learning profiles in foreign language classrooms. Marjorie Hall Haley's studies have focused on multiple intelligences differentiation. Robert Sternberg's studies have focused on differentiation by the Triarchic method of instruction. The Sternberg research applied the Triarchic method in a French classroom. The researcher for this action research study sought to apply the Triarchic method in a secondary Spanish classroom. The study tested the hypothesis that differentiation by student's analytical, creative, and practical abilities would improve students' reading comprehension in a secondary, fourth year Spanish class. The scores for the reading comprehension section on the 2005 National Spanish Exam were used as quantitative data to analyze the impact of the intervention between the control and experimental groups. The results of the analysis were not statistically significant. This chapter is dedicated to the discussion of the results and suggestions for further research.

To begin, many elements of the research design were flawed. The researcher only differentiated instruction for the experimental group for three days. The intervention should have taken place during a much longer period of time. The research studies conducted by Haley and Sternberg took place over a period of nine weeks and four to six weeks, respectively. For the present action research study, there was not enough time for the intervention to take effect in the classroom.

Next, the groups that were selected were not comparable for several reasons. The sample populations were different in number and gender. There were twenty-three students in the control group and twenty-four in the experiment group. In both classes, the female to male ratio was unequal. Both classes had more females than male; however, there were considerably more females than males in the experimental group.

Another factor was that the classes met at very different times of the day. The control group was first period, which went from 7:45 to 8:35. The experimental group was a seventh period class, which went from 1:55 to 2:45 in the afternoon. The students' level of

engagement in the two classes was very different due to the different times of the day. Typically, the experimental group class was more engaged than the control group class. The researcher was surprised to see that the scores of the experimental group were lower than the scores from the control group because their readiness levels were slightly more advanced than the control group.

The students in both the control and the experiment groups had not previously worked very much on their reading comprehension skills in Spanish. They had been focusing mostly on grammar and vocabulary, which was not taught in context. They had read one short story and several short passages on Spanish artists; however, the work that accompanied the stories did not ask them truly comprehend the passages or draw any inferences from them. They simply had to respond to questions directly from the text. The National Spanish Exam was the first time that any of students had taken a standardized test in Spanish. Even though the researcher chose to use the Level three exam over the Level four exam, the students were not adequately prepared for this type of assessment.

The researcher also had limited experience with the Triarchic method of instruction. She had a solid understanding of the theory behind the method but it had only been used to differentiated instruction in one other circumstance that did not involve the level four students that were focus of this research study.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The researcher has attributed the statistical *insignificance* of the research study to the flaws in the design. It is believed that the same study could be conducted in the future with different results if the design were better planned from the outset. The researcher has made the following suggestions for future research:

- The research should be conducted over a longer period of time. The time frame for intervention should be more approximate to what Haley and Sternberg have done in their studies. The researcher suggests a minimal time period of three to four weeks.

- The classes should better represent the general population. Each group should be of at least thirty students, which would allow the researcher to use a parametric T-test for independent means. The male to female ratio should also be more even.
- The schedules of the classes that are used in a research study, such as this one, should meet at closer times during the day.
- The students should be better prepared in reading comprehension skills in Spanish in order to better prepare them for an assessment like the National Spanish Exam.
- The researcher should be more familiar and comfortable with implementing the Triarchic method in the classroom.
- Qualitative data should be collected in order to assess the students' personal reactions to the intervention.

CONCLUSION

The current research study tested the hypothesis that differentiation by students analytical, creative, and practical abilities would improve students reading comprehension in a fourth year, secondary Spanish class. Although the study does not statistically support the Triarchic method as the more effective method in teaching reading comprehension in a fourth year Spanish classroom, this research warrants further investigation. As American society becomes more diverse, the need increases for differentiated instruction in order to reach different learners. The need also increases for a people that can communicate in more than one language. Learner-centered instruction has the potential to positively effect the personal interactions and academic experiences of both students and teachers in all

disciplines. In foreign language classrooms, it can potentially make a difference in students learning how to communicate in a second language.

Appendix A: Triarchic Theory of Intelligences Robert Sternberg

Mark each sentence T if you like to do the activity and F if you do not like to do the activity.

- | | |
|--|------|
| 1. Analyzing characters when I'm reading or listening to a story | ---- |
| 2. Designing new things | ---- |
| 3. Taking things apart and fixing them | ---- |
| 4. Comparing and contrasting points of view | ---- |
| 5. Coming up with ideas | ---- |
| 6. Learning through hands-on activities | ---- |
| 7. Criticizing my own and other kids' work | ---- |
| 8. Using my imagination | ---- |
| 9. Putting into practice things I learned | ---- |
| 10. Thinking clearly and analytically | ---- |
| 11. Thinking of alternative solutions | ---- |
| 12. Working with people in teams or groups | ---- |
| 13. Solving logical problems | ---- |
| 14. Noticing things others often ignore | ---- |
| 15. Resolving conflicts | ---- |
| 16. Evaluating my own and other's points of view | ---- |
| 17. Thinking in pictures and images | ---- |
| 18. Advising friends on their problems | ---- |
| 19. Explaining difficult ideas or problems to others | ---- |
| 20. Supposing things were different | ---- |
| 21. Convincing someone to do something | ---- |
| 22. Making inferences and deriving conclusions | ---- |
| 23. Drawing | ---- |
| 24. Learning by interacting with others | ---- |
| 25. Sorting and classifying | ---- |
| 26. Inventing new words, games, approaches | ---- |
| 27. Applying my knowledge | ---- |
| 28. Using graphic organizers or images to organize your thoughts | ---- |
| 29. Composing | ---- |
| 30. Adapting to new situations | ---- |

Triarchic Theory of Intelligence Key

Transfer your answers from the survey to the key. The column with the most True responses is your dominant intelligence.

Analytical	Creative	Practical
1. ____	2. ____	3. ____
4. ____	5. ____	6. ____
7. ____	8. ____	9. ____
10. ____	11. ____	12. ____
13. ____	14. ____	15. ____
16. ____	17. ____	18. ____
19. ____	20. ____	21. ____
22. ____	23. ____	24. ____
25. ____	26. ____	27. ____
28. ____	29. ____	30. ____

Total Number of True:

Analytical _____

Creative _____

Practical _____

N. Smith (2004)
Adapted from Sternberg, R. & Grigenko, E. (2000) Teaching Successful Intelligence.

APPENDIX B

CONTROL GROUP LESSON PLANS

ABRIDGED LESSON PLAN

DATE: Tuesday April 4th, 2006

GRADE LEVEL / SUBJECT/TOPIC: 11th and 12th/ Spanish IV/ "El Abanico" por Vicente Riva Palacio

DEVELOPED BY: Mary Danielle Burton

STANDARDS ADDRESSED:

Listening and Reading for Understanding

SIV.3 The student will comprehend spoken and written Spanish found in a variety of authentic sources that have been prepared for various purposes.

1. Identify various elements in spoken and written texts in Spanish such as plot, theme, setting, and characters.
2. Understand some subtleties of meaning, such as intent, humor, and tone in a variety of level-appropriate works in Spanish that are culturally authentic, such as radio and television segments or literary passages.

RESOURCES: Textbook "Galería de Vida y Arte": "El Abanico" por Vicente Rive Palacio

LENGTH OF LESSON: One day (50 minute class period)

PLANNING WHAT STUDENTS WILL:

KNOW (STANDARDS/CONTENT):

- Palabras Clave I: aborrecer, capaz, daba (dar) con, relámpago, tienes (tener) ganas
- El Abanico (Parte I): characters, setting, plot, theme, intent, humor, tone

UNDERSTAND (BIG IDEAS, ENDURING UNDERSTANDINGS):

- BIG IDEAS/CONCEPTS: Literary Analysis; comprehension of authentic texts.
- ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS (HOW OR WHY): Why is it important to be able to comprehend authentic texts in Spanish? How and when might we be able to use this skill? what knowledge can be gained from literature? How do we identify the various elements of literary passages? Why do analyze literature for these elements?

DO (SKILLS, PERFORMANCE):

- THE STUDENT WILL: 1) Comprehend authentic texts in Spanish; 2) Analyze literature for basic literary elements; 3) Demonstrate knowledge through vocabulary practice and reading comprehension questions.

LEARNING EXPERIENCE:

NOTE: La tarea for Monday April 3rd:

1. Review Palabras Claves I and do the Práctica on page 209
2. Read part I of "El Abanico"
3. Complete the Comprensión I on page 215.

INTRODUCTION: The teacher presents the students with a real Spanish fan. The class then reads and discusses pages 207 and 208.

BODY:

1. Define the Palabras Claves I on page 209
2. Review and check answers to the Práctica on page 209.
3. Review the Comprensión I on page 215
4. Review Palabras Claves II on page 209.
5. Teacher discusses the following literary elements: plot, theme, setting, and characters.
6. LA TAREA: 1) Complete the Palabras Claves II Práctica on page 210
 - 2) Read "El Abanico" Part II, pages 212-213
 - 3) Complete Comprensión II, page 215

ABRIDGED LESSON PLAN**DATE:** Wednesday April 5th, 2006**GRADE LEVEL / SUBJECT/TOPIC:** 11th and 12th/ Spanish IV/ "El Abanico" por Vicente Riva Palacio**DEVELOPED BY:** Mary Danielle Burton**STANDARDS ADDRESSED:****Listening and Reading for Understanding**

SIV.3 The student will comprehend spoken and written Spanish found in a variety of authentic sources that have been prepared for various purposes.

3. Identify various elements in spoken and written texts in Spanish such as plot, theme, setting, and characters.
4. Understand some subtleties of meaning, such as intent, humor, and tone in a variety of level-appropriate works in Spanish that are culturally authentic, such as radio and television segments or literary passages.

RESOURCES: Textbook "Galería de Vida y Arte": "El Abanico" por Vicente Riva Palacio**LENGTH OF LESSON:** One day (50 minute class period)**PLANNING WHAT STUDENTS WILL:****KNOW (STANDARDS/CONTENT):**

- Palabras Clave II: embajada, exige (exigir), mundanal, soberbia, vacilar
- El Abanico (Parte II): characters, setting, plot, theme, intent, humor, tone

UNDERSTAND (BIG IDEAS, ENDURING UNDERSTANDINGS):

- BIG IDEAS/CONCEPTS: Literary Analysis; Comprehension of authentic texts in Spanish.
- ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS (HOW OR WHY): Why is it important to be able to comprehend authentic texts in Spanish? How and when might we be able to use this skill? What knowledge can be gained from literature? How do we identify the various elements of literary passages? Why do analyze literature for these elements?

DO (SKILLS, PERFORMANCE):

- THE STUDENT WILL: 1) Comprehend authentic texts in Spanish; 2) Analyze literature for basic literary elements; 3) Demonstrate knowledge through vocabulary practice and reading comprehension questions.

LEARNING EXPERIENCE:

INTRODUCTION: Ask students if they are familiar with a story that is similar to “El Abanico”.

BODY:

1. Review and check answers for the Palabras Claves II Práctica on page 210.
2. Review and check answers for the Comprensión II on page 215
3. Palabras Claves III: Define, complete, and review the Práctica on page 210.
4. Further discuss the literary elements.
5. LA TAREA: 1) Read “El Abanico” Parte III, pages 213-214
2) Complete Comprensión III, page 216

ABRIDGED LESSON PLAN**DATE:** Thursday April 6th, 2006**GRADE LEVEL / SUBJECT/TOPIC:** 11th and 12th/ Spanish IV/ "El Abanico" por Vicente Riva Palacio**DEVELOPED BY:** Mary Danielle Burton**STANDARDS ADDRESSED:****Listening and Reading for Understanding**

SIV.3 The student will comprehend spoken and written Spanish found in a variety of authentic sources that have been prepared for various purposes.

5. Identify various elements in spoken and written texts in Spanish such as plot, theme, setting, and characters.
6. Understand some subtleties of meaning, such as intent, humor, and tone in a variety of level-appropriate works in Spanish that are culturally authentic, such as radio and television segments or literary passages.

RESOURCES: Textbook "Galería de Vida y Arte"**LENGTH OF LESSON:** One day (50 minute class period)**PLANNING WHAT STUDENTS WILL:****KNOW (STANDARDS/CONTENT):**

- Palabras Clave III: apuestas, bandeja, desplegar, estorbar, rasgar, tropezar
- El Abanico (Parte III): characters, setting, plot, theme, intent, humor, tone

UNDERSTAND (BIG IDEAS, ENDURING UNDERSTANDINGS):

- BIG IDEAS/CONCEPTS: Literary Analysis
- ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS (HOW OR WHY): Why is it important to be able to comprehend authentic texts in Spanish? How and when might we be able to use this skill? what knowledge can be gained from literature? How do we identify the various elements of literary passages? Why do analyze literature for these elements?

DO (SKILLS, PERFORMANCE):

- THE STUDENT WILL: 1) Comprehend authentic texts in Spanish; 2) Analyze literature for basic literary elements; 3) Demonstrate knowledge through vocabulary practice and reading comprehension questions.

LEARNING EXPERIENCE:

INTRODUCTION: Ask students how their perspective on relationships differs from the relationships in the story.

BODY:

1. Define Palabras Claves III.
2. Review the Práctica III on page 210.
3. Read Parte III together in class.
4. Review Comprensión III A, page. 216

CLOSURE: The teacher asks the students what Palacio's main point was and what, if anything, did they gain from reading the story.

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP LESSON PLANS

COMPREHENSIVE LESSON PLAN

DATE: Tuesday, April 4th, 2006

GRADE LEVEL / SUBJECT/TOPIC: 11th and 12th/ Spanish IV/ "El Abanico" por Vicente Riva Palacio

DEVELOPED BY: Mary Danielle Burton

STANDARDS ADDRESSED:

Listening and Reading for Understanding

SIV.3 The student will comprehend spoken and written Spanish found in a variety of authentic sources that have been prepared for various purposes.

1. Identify various elements in spoken and written texts in Spanish such as plot, theme, setting, and characters.
2. Understand some subtleties of meaning, such as intent, humor, and tone in a variety of level-appropriate works in Spanish that are culturally authentic, such as radio and television segments or literary passages.

RESOURCES: Textbook "Galería de Arte y Vida"; un abanico de España, task assignment sheet

LENGTH OF LESSON: One-day (50 minute) class period

PLANNING WHAT STUDENTS WILL:

KNOW (STANDARDS/CONTENT):

- Palabras Claves I: aborrecer, capaz, daba (dar) con, relámpago, tienes (tener) ganas
- El Abanico (Parte I): characters, setting, plot, theme, intent, humor, tone

UNDERSTAND (BIG IDEAS, ENDURING UNDERSTANDINGS)

- BIG IDEAS (RELATE TWO OR MORE CONCEPTS THE LESSON ADDRESSES): that the comprehension of authentic texts and literary analysis provides us with a new lens through which we can view culture.
- ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS (HOW OR WHY): Why is it important to be able to comprehend authentic texts in Spanish? How and when might we be able to use this skill? What knowledge can be gained from literature? How do we identify the various elements of literary passages? Why do we analyze literature for these elements?

DO (SKILLS, PERFORMANCE – ACTION VERBS):

- THE STUDENT WILL: 1) Comprehend authentic texts in Spanish; 2) Analyze literature for basic literary elements; 3) Demonstrate knowledge through vocabulary practice and reading comprehension questions.

PLANNING PRE-ASSESSMENT:

TEACHER DOES:

- WHAT STRATEGY DID YOU USE? Sternberg Intelligence Preference Survey

- **HOW WERE RESULTS USED TO DESIGN INSTRUCTION?** Results were used to group students' according to their strongest intelligence preference.

STUDENTS DO: Complete the Sternberg Intelligence Preference Survey

PLANNING THE LEARNING EXPERIENCE:

NOTE: La Tarea for Monday, April 3, 2006: 1) Complete Palabras Claves I: Práctica on page 209; 2) Read "El Abanico" Part I; 3) Complete Comprensión I, page 215

INTRODUCTION (HOOK):

- **TEACHER DOES:** 1) Reads page 207 to the class; 2) Presents the class with a real "Abanico"; 3) Reads paragraphs two and three on page 208 to the class. We will discuss the ideas behind the passages.
- **STUDENTS DO:** Listen and read along with the teacher; Ask any questions that may come to mind and participate in the class discussion.

BODY:

- **TEACHER DOES:**
 - 1) Reviews answers to "la tarea": Práctica on page 208 & Comprensión I on page 215
 - 2) Lets students know their strongest intelligence preference and groups them accordingly. Then the teacher explains each activity.
- **STUDENTS DO:**
 - 1) Students correct answers and ask questions.

2) Differentiated Activities

Analytical: Identify the following elements of the story: plot, theme, setting, and characters.

Practical: Write (in Spanish) an advertisement for the theatrical reproduction of "El Abanico".

Creative: Design a graphic Organizer that addresses the following literary elements: plot, theme, setting, and characters.

***** When the analytical and the creative groups are finished, they will meet and combine their work*****

ANALYTICAL	PRACTICAL	CREATIVE
Lucía Tortilla Margarita Paco Ricardo Carmen María Consuela Adriana	Chihuahua Tigre Graciela Susana Diego Sergio Zoraida Taco	Paz Rafael Chico Isabel Raquel Ana Marisol

• IF DIFFERENTIATED:

- WHAT(content, process, product)? Content
- HOW (readiness, interest, learning profile)? Learning Profile; Sternberg Intelligence Preference
- WHY (What identified need prompted you to differentiate this way)? Survey

CLOSURE:

- TEACHER DOES: Has each group share the different products of the day.
- STUDENTS DO: Share the products and discuss the story elements.

NOTE: LA TAREA: 1) Palabras Claves II y Práctica on page 210; 2) Read “El Abanico” Parte II, pages 212-213; 3) Comprensión II, page 215.

ASSESSMENT/CULMINATING PERFORMANCE

- DESCRIPTION: All activities for the day
- HOW DID YOU MEASURE:
 - CONTENT (know): Vocabulary practice and comprehension questions.
 - UNDERSTANDINGS (related to big ideas): the products
 - SKILLS (be able to do): Homework and products

© pending: Brimijoin & Gould, 2005

Analytical Assignment: Identifica los elementos siguientes del cuento "El Abanico".

el trama (plot: struggle found in fiction. Conflict/Plot may be internal or external and is best seen in (1) Man in conflict with another Man; (2) Man in conflict in Nature; (3) Man in conflict with self).

el tema (theme is the general idea or insight about life that a writer wishes to express);

el escenario (setting: determined time and place in fiction);

los caracteres (characters);

http://www.tnellen.com/cybereng/lit_terms.

COMPREHENSIVE LESSON PLAN**DATE:** Wednesday, April 5th, 2006**GRADE LEVEL / SUBJECT/TOPIC:** 11th and 12th/ Spanish IV/ “El Abanico” por Vicente Riva Palacio**DEVELOPED BY:** Mary Danielle Burton**STANDARDS ADDRESSED:*****Listening and Reading for Understanding***

SIV.3 The student will comprehend spoken and written Spanish found in a variety of authentic sources that have been prepared for various purposes.

1. Identify various elements in spoken and written texts in Spanish such as plot, theme, setting, and characters.
2. Understand some subtleties of meaning, such as intent, humor, and tone in a variety of level-appropriate works in Spanish that are culturally authentic, such as radio and television segments or literary passages.

RESOURCES: Textbook “Galería de Arte y Vida”; un abanico de España, graphic organizers**LENGTH OF LESSON:** One-day (50 minute) class period**PLANNING WHAT STUDENTS WILL:****KNOW (STANDARDS/CONTENT):**

- Palabras Claves II: embajada, exige (exigir), mundanal, soberbia, vacilaría (vacilar)
- El Abanico (Parte II): characters, setting, plot, theme, intent, humor, tone

UNDERSTAND (BIG IDEAS, ENDURING UNDERSTANDINGS)

- BIG IDEAS (RELATE TWO OR MORE CONCEPTS THE LESSON ADDRESSES): that the comprehension of authentic texts and literary analysis provides us with a new lens through which we can view culture.
- ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS (HOW OR WHY): Why is it important to be able to comprehend authentic texts in Spanish? How and when might we be able to use this skill? What knowledge can be gained from literature? How do we identify the various elements of literary passages? Why do we analyze literature for these elements?

DO (SKILLS, PERFORMANCE – ACTION VERBS):

- THE STUDENT WILL: 1) Comprehend authentic texts in Spanish; 2) Analyze literature for basic literary elements; 3) Demonstrate knowledge through vocabulary practice and reading comprehension questions.

PLANNING PRE-ASSESSMENT:**TEACHER DOES:**

- WHAT STRATEGY DID YOU USE? Sternberg Intelligence Preference Survey

- HOW WERE RESULTS USED TO DESIGN INSTRUCTION? Results were used to group students' according to their strongest intelligence preference.

STUDENTS DO: Complete the Sternberg Intelligence Preference Survey

PLANNING THE LEARNING EXPERIENCE:

INTRODUCTION (HOOK):

- TEACHER DOES: Asks students if they know another story similar to "El Abanico"
- STUDENTS DO Answer the question and discuss their examples.

BODY:

- TEACHER DOES:
 - 1) Gives answers to "la tarea": Palabras Claves II, Práctica on page 210; 2) page 215 Comprensión II.
- STUDENTS DO:
 - 1) Students check and correct their answers and ask any questions that they might have.
 - 2) **Differentiated Activities**

Analytical: Compare and contrast the qualities that el Marques is looking for in a partner to the qualities that you might look for in a partner. Use the organizer that is provided.

graphic

Practical: Make a Spanish to English vocabulary list: Skim parts I and II for unfamiliar vocabulary. When you are finished, ask other students for words that they came across that they didn't know.

Creative: Write a quick summary of what has happened so far. Then predict what will happen in Parte III. Support your predictions with evidence from the story. Share your predictions with other creative students.

ANALYTICAL	PRACTICAL	CREATIVE
Lucía Tortilla Margarita Paco Ricardo Carmen María Consuela Adriana	Chihuahua Tigre Graciela Susana Diego Sergio Zoraida Taco	Paz Rafael Chico Isabel Raquel Ana Marisol

- IF DIFFERENTIATED
 - WHAT(content, process, product)? Content
 - HOW (readiness, interest, learning profile)? Learning Profile: Sternberg Intelligence Preference
 - WHY (What identified need prompted you to differentiate this way)? Survey

CLOSURE:

- TEACHER DOES: Has each group share the different products of the day.
- STUDENTS DO: Share the products.

ASSESSMENT/CULMINATING PERFORMANCE

- DESCRIPTION: Combination of day's activities
- HOW DID YOU MEASURE:
 - CONTENT (know): Vocabulary practice and comprehension questions.
 - UNDERSTANDINGS (related to big ideas): the products
 - SKILLS (be able to do): A combination of the homework and the products.

NOTE: LA TAREA: 1). Palabras Claves III and the Práctica on page 210; 2) Read Parte III, pages 213-214; 3) Complete Comprensión III A, p. 216

© pending: Brimijoin & Gould, 2005

Analítico: Compare y haga contraste lo que el Marques busca en una compañera con lo que tú buscas en un/una compañero(a). Dé, por los menos, siete ejemplos o característicos.

El Marques busca....	Yo busco...

Práctico: En el cuento busque palabras que ya no conoce. Haga una lista de vocabulario del cuento "El Abanico". Las palabras deben ser de español a inglés. Encuentre, por lo menos, diez palabras nuevas.

Español	Inglés
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.
6.	6.
7.	7.
8.	8.
9.	9.

COMPREHENSIVE LESSON PLAN**DATE:** Thursday, April 6th, 2006**GRADE LEVEL / SUBJECT/TOPIC:** 11th and 12th/ Spanish IV/ "El Abanico" por Vicente Riva Palacio**DEVELOPED BY:** Mary Danielle Burton**STANDARDS ADDRESSED:*****Listening and Reading for Understanding***

SIV.3 The student will comprehend spoken and written Spanish found in a variety of authentic sources that have been prepared for various purposes.

1. Identify various elements in spoken and written texts in Spanish such as plot, theme, setting, and characters.
2. Understand some subtleties of meaning, such as intent, humor, and tone in a variety of level-appropriate works in Spanish that are culturally authentic, such as radio and television segments or literary passages.

RESOURCES: Textbook "Galería de Arte y Vida", "El Abanico"**LENGTH OF LESSON:** One-day (50 minute) class period**PLANNING WHAT STUDENTS WILL:****KNOW (STANDARDS/CONTENT):**

- Palabras Claves III: apuestos, bandeja, desplegó (desplegar), estorbando (estorbar), rasgó (rasgar), tropezó (tropezar)
- El Abanico (Parte III): characters, setting, plot, theme, intent, humor, tone

UNDERSTAND (BIG IDEAS, ENDURING UNDERSTANDINGS)

- BIG IDEAS (RELATE TWO OR MORE CONCEPTS THE LESSON ADDRESSES): that the comprehension of authentic texts and literary analysis provides us with a new lens through which we can view culture.
- ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS (HOW OR WHY): Why is it important to be able to comprehend authentic texts in Spanish? How and when might we be able to use this skill? What knowledge can be gained from literature? How do we identify the various elements of literary passages? Why do we analyze literature for these elements?

DO (SKILLS, PERFORMANCE – ACTION VERBS):

- THE STUDENT WILL: 1) Comprehend authentic texts in Spanish; 2) Analyze literature for basic literary elements; 3) Demonstrate knowledge through vocabulary practice and reading comprehension questions.

PLANNING PRE-ASSESSMENT:**TEACHER DOES:**

- WHAT STRATEGY DID YOU USE? Sternberg Intelligence Preference Survey

- **HOW WERE RESULTS USED TO DESIGN INSTRUCTION?** Results were used to group students' according to their strongest intelligence preference.

STUDENTS DO: Complete the Sternberg Intelligence Preference Survey

PLANNING THE LEARNING EXPERIENCE:

INTRODUCTION (HOOK):

- **TEACHER DOES:** Asks students how their perspective on relationships differs from the relationships in the story.
- **STUDENTS DO:** Respond to the questions.

BODY:

- **TEACHER DOES:**
 - 1) Review answers to "la tarea": Palabras Claves III Práctica on page 210; Comprensión III A on page 216.
- **STUDENTS DO:**
 - 1) Students check and correct their answers and ask any questions that they might have.

2) Differentiated Activities

Analytical: Critique the story for the following elements: intent, tone, humor.

Practical: Write an abbreviated translation of "El Abanico" for a children's book.

Creative: Create an alternate ending to the story. Students must write this in narrative form in Spanish.

ANALYTICAL	PRACTICAL	CREATIVE
Lucia Tortilla Margarita Paco Ricardo Carmen Maria Consuela Adriana	Chihuahua Tigre Graciela Susana Diego Sergio Zoraida Taco	Paz Rafael Chico Isabel Raquel Ana Marisol

CLOSURE:

- TEACHER DOES: Has each group share the different products of the day .
- STUDENTS DO: Share the products

ASSESSMENT/CULIMATING PERFORMANCE

- DESCRIPTION: Combination of day's activities
- HOW DID YOU MEASURE:
 - CONTENT (know): Vocabulary Practice and comprehension questions
 - UNDERSTANDS (related to big ideas): the products
 - SKILLS (be able to do): A combination of the homework and the products

© pending: Brimijoin & Gould, 2005

DAY FOUR: EXPERIMENT AND CONTROL LESSON PLAN

ABRIDGED LESSON PLAN

DATE: Friday, April 7, 2006

GRADE LEVEL / SUBJECT/TOPIC: 11th and 12th/ Spanish IV/ National Spanish Exam (Reading Comprehension)

DEVELOPED BY: Mary Danielle Burton

STANDARDS ADDRESSED:

Listening and Reading for Understanding

- SIV.3 The student will comprehend spoken and written Spanish found in a variety of authentic sources that have been prepared for various purposes.
7. Identify various elements in spoken and written texts in Spanish such as plot, theme, setting, and characters.
 2. Understand some subtleties of meaning, such as intent, humor, and tone in a variety of level-appropriate works in Spanish that are culturally authentic, such as radio and television segments or literary passages.

RESOURCES: 2005 National Spanish Exam

LENGTH OF LESSON: One day (50-minute class period)

PLANNING WHAT STUDENTS WILL:

KNOW (STANDARDS/CONTENT): n/a

UNDERSTAND (BIG IDEAS, ENDURING UNDERSTANDINGS):

- BIG IDEAS/CONCEPTS: reading comprehension and literary analysis
- ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS (HOW OR WHY): Why is it important to be able to comprehend authentic texts in Spanish? How and when might we be able to use this skill? What knowledge can be gained from literature? How do we identify the various elements of literary passages? Why do we analyze literature for these elements?

DO (SKILLS, PERFORMANCE):

- THE STUDENT WILL: Demonstrate reading comprehension through the NSE.

LEARNING EXPERIENCE:

BODY: 1) Students take the National Spanish Exam (reading comprehension portion only); 2) If they finish earlier, students should begin working on test corrections from the preterite v. imperfect exam.

References

- Byram, M. (Ed). (2003). Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning. New York: Taylor & Francis Group. www.netlibrary.com
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Gardner, H. (2005). *Multiple Lenses on The Mind*. Paper presented at the ExpoGestion Conference. Bogota, Colombia.
- Glisan, , E.W. & Shrum, J. L. Teacher's handbook: contextualized language instruction. 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Thomson Heinle.
- Grigorenko, E.L, Jarvin, L., and Sternberg, R.J. (2002). School-based tests of the triarchic theory of intelligence: Three settings, three samples, three syllabi. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27, p. 167-208.
- Grigorenko, E.L. and Sternberg, R.J. (2004). Successful intelligence in the classroom. *Theory into Practice* 43 (4).
- Haley, M.H. (2004). Learner-centered instruction and the theory of multiple intelligences with second language learners. *Teachers College Record*, 106, p. 163-180.
- Lee, J.F. and VanPatten, B. (Eds). (1995). *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Levy, S. (1996). *Starting from scratch: one class builds its own curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Palacio, R.V. (1997). *El Abanico. Galería de arte y vida*. New York. Glencoe/McGraw Hill.
- Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century*. (1999). Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, Inc.
- Sternberg, R.J. (2005). The triarchic theory of successful intelligence. In D.P. Flanagan & P.L Harrison (Eds), *Contemporary intellectual assessment*, 2nd ed. (pp. 103-119). New York: Guilford Publications, Inc.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1996). *Successful intelligence*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Tomlinson, C.A. (2003) *Fulfilling the promise of the differentiated classroom: strategies and tools for responsive teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.



